Optimal and non-optimal broadcasting of entanglement and correlations

Aditya Jain,[1] Indranil Chakrabarty,[2] and Sourav Chatterjee[1]

[1] *Center for Computational Natural Sciences and Bioinformatics, International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Telangana-500032, India.*

[2] *Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research, International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Telangana-500032, India.*

(Dated: February 8, 2017)

In this work, we investigate the local and nonlocal broadcasting of entanglement and correlations in more general sense for the general two-qubit mixed state using asymmetric Pauli cloners. Interestingly, we claim that non-optimal broadcasting of entanglement is not different from optimal broadcasting using asymmetric cloners. Surprisingly, this is exactly opposite to the behaviour for geometric discord, a measure of correlation beyond entanglement. Here, we have no broadcasting for the optimal situation whereas we can broadcast correlations in the non-optimal scenario. This mutual exclusivity once again brings out the fact that these measures are fundamentally different. Further, we notice that in general and also in particular example of Bell-diagonal states, with the increase of symmetricity of the cloner, the broadcasting range increases.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1702.02123v1 [quant-ph] 7 Feb 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last few decades, we have seen many instances where quantum information processing is more advantageous than its classical counterpart. The things that cross our mind when we talk about advantage are the additional tasks which can be achieved using quantum resources. We have seen that this list is not small. Information processing tasks like teleportation [17], superdense coding [18], secret sharing [19] do not have any classical analogue and are also very different from the counterparts. Interestingly, these advantages not only come from the things we can accomplish but also from restrictions that nature itself imposes on us. In quantum mechanics, it is well known that it is impossible to clone an arbitrary quantum state. This leads to the famous No-cloning theorem [1]. More precisely, there exists no quantum mechanical operation which can generate a perfect clone of two non-orthogonal states i.e. transform $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ to $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle$ respectively. But no-cloning is not the only important impossible operation. There are several other impossible operations which are popularly known as No-go theorems [1, 2, 7, 23, 35, 38].

There have been multiple attempts in performing cloning approximately and under different settings. One of the earliest attempts was made by Buzek et al [12] in the year 1996 when they designed a Universal Quantum Cloning Machine (UQCM) which copied states with fidelity $\frac{5}{6}$ which was later proved to be optimal [36]. The machine introduced was input state independent and universal. However, in addition to this, there were other state dependent machines [37]. Another setting in which it has been explored is probabilistic cloning where the cloner can perfectly clone a secretly chosen state from a pool of linearly independent states with a non-zero probability $\eta(0 < \eta < 1)$ [13].

All these cloning machines are symmetric in the sense that they take as input a $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\sigma\rangle$ and transform it to $|\psi'\rangle \otimes |\psi'\rangle$ where $|\sigma\rangle$ is a blank state. There exists another set of cloners known as asymmetric cloners. These cloning machines are involved in producing two different copies of $|\psi'\rangle$ with different fidelities. In particular, they transform $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\sigma\rangle$ into $|\psi_1'\rangle \otimes |\psi_2'\rangle$. Asymmetric quantum cloning in general is useful particularly when analyzing the security of some quantum key distribution protocols, because the optimal eavesdropping strategy, when it is known, often turns out to coincide with optimal asymmetric cloning [14, 15] but this is not always the case [16]. Other applications include telebroadcasting [25] and asymmetric telecloning [25, 28] of states which is useful when information needs to be distributed among parties with varying trust.

One of the many important features that makes quantum mechanics unique is entanglement. In other words, 'inseparability of quantum states' in composite systems is not only a matter of deep interest from physics point of view, but also acts as a pivotal resource in the accomplishment of various information processing tasks as mentioned before [17–21]. So, it is always crucial to have entanglement distributed across various nodes(parties) in a network. It is interesting to see how we can distribute a given amount of entanglement between various pairs of nodes(parties) in a network. There are many ways to achieve this task. In short, this task is primarily known as 'broadcasting of entanglement' [3–7, 11, 22–26]. One of the various ways to achieve this is by cloning. Cloning here can refer to both state-dependent and independent cloning as well as local and nonlocal cloning. Recently it was shown that optimal broadcasting of correlations that go beyond entanglement is impossible [8]. However, if one relaxes the optimal criteria, broadcasting can be achieved. One can also use asymmetric cloners to achieve broadcasting of entanglement and this was considered by Iulia Ghiu [25] where the task was carried out for a non-maximally entangled state using optimal local and nonlocal cloning machines. Apart from correlations, there have been attempts to broadcast other important quantities such as quantum coherence [10].

In this work, we take the most general version of the cloning operation i.e. asymmetric cloning (symmetric cloning is a special case of this) and the most general two-

qubit mixed state as a resource to broadcast entanglement and correlations beyond entanglement. We consider both optimal and non-optimal as well as local and nonlocal broadcasting. Quite counter-intuitively we have both proofs and strong numerical evidence that non-optimal broadcasting of entanglement is no different from the optimal broadcasting, and optimal broadcasting of correlations is impossible. However, non-optimal broadcasting of correlations beyond entanglement is always possible. This brings out a unique and fundamental difference in these measures. Moreover, with the decrease in the asymmetricity of the cloner, we show that the broadcasting range increases. This is not only true for the particular example of Bell-diagonal state but also in general. We show numerically that there is increase in the number of states in the state space of the broadcasting zone with the increase in symmetricity of the cloner.

II. USEFUL DEFINITIONS AND RELATED CONCEPTS

In this section, we give a brief introduction to various concepts which will be useful and related to the main theme of the manuscript. We will try to present these related concepts in the form of definitions.

A. General two qubit mixed state

In this paper, we have considered a general two qubit mixed state as a resource state which is represented in the canonical form as,

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{1}{4}[\mathbb{I}_4 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}(x_i\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2 + y_i\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} t_{ij}\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j] = \{\vec{x},\, \vec{y},\, T\} \quad \text{(say)}, \tag{1}$$

where $x_i = Tr[\rho_{12}(\sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_2)]$, $y_i = Tr[\rho_{12}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_i)]$ are local Bloch vectors. The correlation matrix is given by $T = [t_{ij}]$ where $t_{ij} = Tr[\rho_{12}(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j)]$ with $[\sigma_i;\, i = \{1, 2, 3\}]$ are $2 \otimes 2$ Pauli matrices and $\mathbb{I}_n$ is the identity matrix of order n.

B. Detection of entanglement

The PeresHorodecki (**PH**) [29] criterion is used to test the separability of two quantum mechanical systems 1 and 2, whose joint density matrix is given by ρ_{12}. It is necessary and sufficient criterion for $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$ dimensional bipartite systems. If at least one of the eigenvalues of a partially transposed density operator for a bipartite state ρ_{12} defined as $\rho^T_{m\mu,n\nu} = \rho_{m\nu,n\mu}$ turn out to be negative then we can say that the state ρ is entangled. Equivalently, this criterion can be translated to the condition that determinant of at least one of the two matrices

$$W_3 = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & W_2 & \begin{matrix}\rho_{00,10}\\ \rho_{00,11}\end{matrix} \\ \hline \rho_{10,00} & \rho_{11,00} & \rho_{10,10} \end{array}\right) \text{ and } W_4 = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|c} & & & \begin{matrix}\rho_{01,10}\\ \rho_{01,11}\\ \rho_{11,10}\end{matrix} \\ & W_3 & & \\ \hline \rho_{10,01} & \rho_{11,01} & \rho_{10,11} & \rho_{11,11} \end{array}\right) \tag{2}$$

is negative; with determinant of $W_2 = \begin{bmatrix}\rho_{00,00} & \rho_{01,00}\\ \rho_{00,01} & \rho_{01,01}\end{bmatrix}$ being simultaneously non-negative.

C. Geometric Discord

In the last decade, researchers came up with measures to quantify the correlations in the quantum systems, that go beyond entanglement. There are several such measures. In this article we have chosen geometric discord to quantify the correlations beyond entanglement [32]. Geometric discord (**GD**) is a distance based measure defined for any general two qubit state ρ_{12} as

$$D_G(\rho_{12}) = \min_{\mathcal{X}} ||\rho_{12} - \mathcal{X}||^2, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{X}$ is the set of all classical states of the form $p|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| \otimes \rho_1 + (1-p)|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2| \otimes \rho_2$. Here, $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are two orthonormal basis of subsystem 1. The states ρ_1 and ρ_2 are two density matrices of the subsystem 3. $||X||$ is the trace norm as defined previously. For an arbitrary two-qubit state, the expression for **GD** is as follows :

$$D_G(\rho_{12}) = \frac{1}{4}(||\vec{x}||^2 - ||T||^2 - \lambda_{max}), \tag{4}$$

where λ_{max} is the maximal eigenvalue of the matrix $\Omega = (\vec{x}\vec{x}^t - TT^t)$ where the superscript t denotes transpose and T is the correlation matrix of ρ_{12}.

D. Asymmetric quantum cloning

A cloning machine is said to be asymmetric when it takes $|\psi\rangle$ and a blank state as input, and transforms it into two different copies $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$. In this paper, we use two kinds of optimal cloning machines. For broadcasting using local cloner, we use the optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning machine [25],

$$U_a^l|0\rangle|00\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+p^2+q^2}}(|000\rangle + p|011\rangle + q|101\rangle),$$
$$U_a^l|1\rangle|00\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+p^2+q^2}}(|111\rangle + p|100\rangle + q|010\rangle), \tag{5}$$

where p is the asymmetric parameter of the machine and $p + q = 1$ The first two qubits represent the clones and the last one is the ancilla.

For nonlocal broadcasting, we use the nonlocal optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning machine [25],

$$U_a^{nl}|j\rangle|00\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+3(p^2+q^2)}}(|j\rangle|j\rangle|j\rangle + p\sum_{r=1}^{3}|j\rangle|\overline{j+r}\rangle|\overline{j+r}\rangle + q\sum_{r=1}^{3}|\overline{j+r}\rangle|j\rangle|\overline{j+r}\rangle), \quad (6)$$

where $j \in \{0,1\}$ and $\overline{k+m} = (k+m)$ modulo 4.

E. Broadcasting of entanglement using asymmetric cloners

Local broadcasting

We start with two parties A and B sharing an entangled input state ρ_{12} as in Eq.(1), with qubits 1 and 2 on A's side and B's side respectively. After the application of local asymmetric cloning operation $U_1 \otimes U_2$, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, the nonlocal output states are given by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{14} = Tr_{23}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{23}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})],$$
$$\tilde{\rho}_{23} = Tr_{14}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{14}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})], \quad (7)$$

while the local output states are given by,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{13} = Tr_{24}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{24}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})],$$
$$\tilde{\rho}_{24} = Tr_{13}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{13}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})], \quad (8)$$

The requirement for broadcasting of entanglement between the desired pairs $(1,4)/(1,2)$ and $(2,3)/(3,4)$ can be fulfilled by maximising the entanglement between the output nonlocal pairs $(1,4)$ and $(2,3)$ irrespective of the local pairs $(1,3)$ and $(2,4)$. However, to achieve optimal broadcasting, we need to minimise the amount of entanglement within the local parties. In other words, $E_{total} = E_l + E_{nl}$. To maximise E_{nl}, we set $E_l = 0$. Thus, for optimal broadcasting the local pairs are separable.

However, for non-optimal broadcasting, the condition that nonlocal pairs remain inseparable is sufficient. It is non-optimal because some amount of entanglement will be distributed among the local pairs thereby reducing the amount of entanglement across the non-local pairs.

Nonlocal broadcasting

We start with two parties A and B sharing an entangled input state ρ_{12} as in Eq.(1), with qubits 1 and 2 on A's side and B's side respectively. After the application of nonlocal asymmetric cloning operation U_{12}, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, the nonlocal output states are given by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = Tr_{34}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{34}[U_{12}(\rho_{12})],$$
$$\tilde{\rho}_{34} = Tr_{12}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{12}[U_{12}(\rho_{12})], \quad (9)$$



FIG. 1: The figure on left depicts asymmetric broadcasting of ρ_{12} to produce nonlocal pairs $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ via local cloning. On the right, the broadcasting is taking place via nonlocal cloning.

while the local output states, given by

$$\tilde{\rho}_{13} = Tr_{24}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{24}[U_{12}(\rho_{12})],$$
$$\tilde{\rho}_{24} = Tr_{13}[\tilde{\rho}_{1234}] = Tr_{13}[U_{12}(\rho_{12})], \quad (10)$$

The broadcasting is said to be optimal when the nonlocal pairs, $(1,2)$ and $(3,4)$, are entangled and the local pairs,$(1,3)$ and $(2,4)$, are separable.

However, for non-optimal broadcasting, the inseparability of the nonlocal pairs is a sufficient criteria. Non-optimality arises due to the presence of some amount of entanglement in the local pairs.

F. Broadcasting of QCsbE using asymmetric cloners

As we have mentioned before that recent researches reveal that in principle, there can be quantum correlations beyond entanglement. So measures of entanglement are insufficient to quantify such correlations. In this work, we bring in geometric discord (**GD**) to quantify such correlations. In this section we describe the meaning of broadcasting of such correlations [32].

Optimal Broadcasting (Local and Nonlocal)

Similar to entanglement, here also we consider two parties A and B sharing a correlated input state ρ_{12}, with qubits 1 and 2 on A's side and B's side respectively. A correlated input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast optimally after the application of local asymmetric cloning operation $U_1 \otimes U_2$, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, if for some values of the input state parameters, the nonlocal output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ of A and B have non-zero discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) \neq 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) \neq 0$, while the local output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ of A and B have zero discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 0$.

Similarly, a correlated input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast optimally after the application of nonlocal

asymmetric cloning operation U_{12} together on qubits 1 and 2, if for some values of the input state parameters, the nonlocal output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ of A and B have non-zero discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) \neq 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) \neq 0$, while the local output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ of A and B have zero-discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{24}) = 0$.

Non-Optimal Broadcasting (Local and Nonlocal)

A correlated input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast non-optimally after the application of local asymmetric cloning operation $U_1 \otimes U_2$, on the qubits 1 and 2 respectively, if for some values of the input state parameters, the nonlocal output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ of A and B have non-zero discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) \neq 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{23}) \neq 0$. It is non-optimal because there are no constraints on the local outputs and they can have non-zero discord too.

Similarly, a correlated input state ρ_{12} is said to be broadcast non-optimally after the application of nonlocal asymmetric cloning operation U_{12} together on qubits 1 and 2, if for some values of the input state parameters, the nonlocal output states, given by $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ of A and B have non-zero discord i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) \neq 0, D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{34}) \neq 0$.

III. BROADCASTING OF ENTANGLEMENT USING ASYMMETRIC CLONERS

A. Optimal broadcasting via local cloning

In this section we describe the broadcasting of entanglement using asymmetric cloners where our resource state is two qubit mixed state. The state is shared between two parties Alice and Bob (as in Eq. (1)). Both of them apply the optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning machine as in Eq.(5).

After cloning and tracing out the ancilla qubits on each side, we obtain the composite system $\tilde{\rho}_{1234}$. We trace out the qubits 2, 4 and 1, 3 to obtain the local output states $\tilde{\rho}_{13}(= Tr_{24}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})])$ on A's side and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}(= Tr_{13}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})])$ on B's side respectively. Similarly, after tracing out the local output states from the composite system, we have the nonlocal output states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}(= Tr_{23}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})])$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}(= Tr_{14}[U_1 \otimes U_2(\rho_{12})])$.

The expressions for the reduced density operators of representing local output states are as follows :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{13} &= \left\{ \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{x}, \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{x}, \frac{pq}{q+p^2}\mathbb{I}_3 \right\} \\ \tilde{\rho}_{24} &= \left\{ \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{y}, \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{y}, \frac{pq}{q+p^2}\mathbb{I}_3 \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Next, we apply Peres-Horodecki criterion to investigate whether the local output states on either side of these two parties are separable or not. After evaluating the determinants of W_2, W_3 and W_4(as in Eq. (2)), we obtain a range involving input state parameters and the parameter of asymmetry within which the local outputs, $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$, are separable. These ranges for $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&\leq\; \|\vec{x}\| \leq 1 - 4p^2q^2 \;, \\ 0 \;&\leq\; \|\vec{y}\| \leq 1 - 4p^2q^2 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The expressions for the reduced density operators of representing nonlocal output states are as follows :

$$\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \tilde{\rho}_{23} = \left\{ \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{x}, \frac{p}{q+p^2}\vec{y}, \frac{pq}{(q+p^2)^2}\mathbb{T} \right\}, \tag{13}$$

where T is the correlation matrix of the initial input state ρ_{12}

We again apply the Peres-Horodecki criterion to determine the condition for which these pairs will be inseparable. The explicit expressions of determinants of W_2^l, W_3^l and W_4^l are given by Eqs. (28), (29) and (30) in Appendix-1.

Now combining these two ranges determining the separability of the local states and inseparability of the nonlocal states, we obtain the range for broadcasting of entanglement. We observe that all the above expressions and ranges reduce to the one in [8] for the case of perfectly symmetric cloner i.e. $p = 1/2$.

In general we find that the broadcasting range increases with increase in symmetricity of the cloner. We demonstrate this using a class of mixed entangled state called Bell-Diagonal states.

Example : Bell Diagonal States

Bell-diagonal states can be expressed as,

$$\rho_{12}^b = \{\vec{0}, \vec{0}, T^b\}, \tag{14}$$

where $\vec{0}$ is the Bloch vector which is a null vector and the correlation matrix is $T^b = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$ with $-1 \leqslant c_i \leqslant 1$.

After applying the local asymmetric cloner and tracing out appropriate qubits, we get the local pairs to be,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \frac{2pq}{1+p^2+q^2}\mathbb{I} \right\} \tag{15}$$

When we check the condition for their separability using the **PH** criterion, we find that the determinants of W_3 and W_4 are always non-negative independent of the input-state parameters and the asymmetry parameter of the cloner, and hence these states are always separable. The nonlocal output states found out similarly are gicen by,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{14} = \tilde{\rho}_{23} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \frac{pq}{(q+p^2)^2}\mathbb{T}^b \right\}, \tag{16}$$

where $\mathbb{T}^b$ is the correlation matrix of the initial input state ρ_{12}^b.

Again, employing the PH criterion, we find that they

are inseparable subject to the following condition on the input state parameter and the asymmetry parameter of the cloner.

$$\begin{aligned}&((A+C_1)^2-(C_2+C_3)^2)((A-C_1)^2-(C_2-C_3)^2)<0\\&Or,(A+C_3)((C_3-A)^2-(C_1-C_2)^2))<0,\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

where $C_i = c_i pq$ and $A = q^2 + 2p^2q + p^4$

Since the local output states are always inseparable, the final broadcasting range coincides with the range on input and asymmetry parameters for which the nonlocal outputs are inseparable.

Next, we demonstrate the gradual decrease in broadcasting range on changing values of the asymmetry parameter p as shown in fig (2). We observe from the figure that as we decrease the value of p from 0.5 to 0.3 the broadcastable region in the state space decreases concentrating towards the corner. We also find that any cloner having $p < 0.297$ is unable to broadcast entanglement in the case of bell-diagonal states. This gives the impression that beyond a certain degree of asymmetry in the cloner, broadcasting becomes impossible.



FIG. 2: The figure shows broadcastable region for Bell-Diagonal States (BDS) when local asymmetric cloners are used. The hue chart on the right shows the variation in the values of the asymmetric parameter p. The broadcasting region increases with the increase in value of p. Dark red region in centre → separable region. Brown → Inseparable region. The corners of the tetrahedron represent broadcastable region.

B. Optimal broadcasting via nonlocal cloning

Here, we investigate the broadcasting of entanglement via nonlocal cloning. We again start with two distant parties sharing a two-qubit mixed state (as in Eq.(1)) but now we apply the nonlocal optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning machine as in Eq.(6).

The obtained nonlocal output states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ after tracing out the appropriate qubits from the composite system $\tilde{\rho}_{1234}$ are represented by,

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \tilde{\rho}_{34} = \left\{\frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{x}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{y}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\mathbb{T}\right\},\tag{18}$$

where $\mathbb{T}$ is the correlation matrix of the initial input state ρ_{12}.

We apply Peres-Horodecki criterion to investigate whether the local output states on either side of these two parties are separable or not. After evaluating the determinants of W_2, W_3 and W_4, we obtain a range involving input state parameters and the parameter of asymmetry within which the local outputs, $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$, are separable. These ranges for $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}0 \;\leq\; \|\vec{x}\| &\leq \frac{1-2pq}{(q+p^2)^2}\;,\\ 0 \;\leq\; \|\vec{y}\| &\leq \frac{1-2pq}{(q+p^2)^2}\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

The expressions for the reduced density operators of representing local output states are as follows :

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{13} &= \left\{\frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{x}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{x}, \frac{pq}{2-3pq}\mathbb{I}_3\right\}\\ \tilde{\rho}_{24} &= \left\{\frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{y}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{y}, \frac{pq}{2-3pq}\mathbb{I}_3\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

We again apply the Peres-Horodecki criterion to determine the condition for which these pairs will be inseparable. The explicit expressions of the determinants of W_2^{nl}, W_3^{nl} and W_4^{nl} are given by Eqs. (31), (32) and (33) in Appendix-2.

Now combining these two ranges determining the separability of the local states and inseparability of the nonlocal states, we obtain the range for broadcasting of entanglement. We observe that all the above expressions and ranges reduce to the one in [8] for the case of perfectly symmetric cloner i.e. $p = 1/2$.

In general we find that the broadcasting range increases with increase in symmetricity of the cloner.

Example : Bell Diagonal States

Once the nonlocal cloner is applied to the state, the nonlocal outputs obtained are

$$\tilde{\rho}_{12} = \tilde{\rho}_{34} = \left\{\frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{x}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\vec{y}, \frac{p(1+p)}{2-3pq}\mathbb{X}^b\right\},\tag{21}$$

where $\mathbb{T}^b$ is the correlation matrix of the initial input state ρ_{12}^b. The inseparability range of these output states is given by :

$$\begin{aligned}&(((K_1-K_3)^2-(d-K_2)^2)((K_1+K_3)^2-(d+K_2)^2)<0\\&Or,\frac{(d+K_3)((K_3-d)^2-(K_1-K_2)^2))}{d}<0,\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

where $K_i = c_i p(1+p)$ and $d = 2 - 3pq$
Similarly, the local output states are described as follows:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{13} = \tilde{\rho}_{24} = \left\{ \vec{0}, \vec{0}, \frac{pq}{2-3pq} \mathbb{I}_3 \right\} \tag{23}$$

The local outputs are independent of the input state parameters and hence are always separable since the determinants of W_3^{nl} and W_4^{nl} yield a positive value unconditionally. Thus, the final range for broadcasting is the same as the inseparability range.

We observe that any cloner having $p < 0.334$ is unable to broadcast entanglement in the case of bell-diagonal states. Next, we demonstrate the gradual decrease in broadcasting range on changing values of the asymmetry parameter p as shown in fig (3) . We observe from the figure that as we decrease the value of p from 0.5 to 0.3 the broadcastable region in the state space decreases concentrating towards the corner. Moreover, we can see no red regions in the graph corresponding to the $p = 0.3$ case. On comparing this with the local case, we conclude that the affect of asymmetricity of the cloner on the ability to broadcast entanglement is more pronounced in the nonlocal case.



FIG. 3: The figure shows broadcastable region for Bell-Diagonal States (BDS) when nonlocal asymmetric cloners are used. The hue chart on the right shows the variation in the values of the asymmetric parameter p. The broadcasting region increases with the increase in value of p. Dark red region in centre → separable region. Brown → Inseparable region. The corners of the tetrahedron represent broadcastable region.

C. Non-Optimal broadcasting via local cloning

In this section, we explore the non-optimal broadcasting of entanglement using local cloners. Specifically, we do a comparative study of optimal and non-optimal broadcasting and arrive at a conclusion that non-optimal broadcasting gives no advantage over optimal broadcasting in terms of broadcasting range. We state this elaborately in the following claim.

Claim : *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^l), it is impossible to carry out broadcasting such that the resultant local ($\tilde{\rho}_{13}, \tilde{\rho}_{24}$) and non-local pairs ($\tilde{\rho}_{14}, \tilde{\rho}_{23}$) are simultaneously entangled.*

Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12}, when optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloner is applied locally at both ends to clone qubits '1 → 3' and '2 → 4', the local output states are obtained as in Eq. (11) and the nonlocal output states are obtained as in Eq. (13). We use the **PH** criterion to check for simultaneous entanglement of an exhaustive ensemble of states $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and discover that they are never entangled simultaneously. Hence, we numerically conclude that it is impossible.

D. Non-Optimal broadcasting via nonlocal cloning

In this section, we explore the non-optimal broadcasting of entanglement using nonlocal cloners. Similar to the previous section, we do a comparative study of optimal and non-optimal broadcasting and arrive at a conclusion that non-optimal broadcasting gives no advantage over optimal broadcasting in terms of broadcasting range. We state this elaborately in the following claim.

Claim : *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^{nl}), it is impossible to carry out broadcasting such that the resultant local ($\tilde{\rho}_{13}, \tilde{\rho}_{24}$) and non-local pairs ($\tilde{\rho}_{12}, \tilde{\rho}_{34}$) are simultaneously entangled.*

Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12}, when optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloner is applied together at both ends to clone qubits, the local output states are obtained as in Eq. (20) and the nonlocal output states are obtained as in Eq. (18). We use the **PH** criterion to check for simutaneous entanglement of an exhaustive ensemble of states $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and discover that they are never entangled simultaneously. Hence, we numerically conclude that it is impossible.

E. Variation of broadcasting range with the asymmetricity of the cloner

In this section, we demonstrate the variation in the number of states broadcast, out of an exhaustive ensemble of 10^5 states, with the asymmetricity of the cloner i.e. with the variation in parameter $0 \leq p \leq 0.5$ where $p = 0.5$ denotes a completely symmetric cloner. We observe from figures (4) and (5) that the number increases with decrease in asymmetricity of the cloner. We note that the performance of the nonlocal cloner is much better as compared to the local cloner. We also observe that below a certain value of p, both local and nonlocal cloners are unable to broadcast states which indicates that beyond a certain amount of asymmetricity, the cloners cannot broadcast entanglement.



FIG. 4: The figure shows the variation in the number of states broadcast with the asymmetricity of the local cloner



FIG. 5: The figure shows the variation in the number of states broadcast with the asymmetricity of the nonlocal cloner

IV. OPTIMAL BROADCASTING OF CORRELATIONS BEYOND ENTANGLEMENT USING ASYMMETRIC CLONER

In this section we investigate the broadcasting of QCsbE under the unital channel (Λ_u) using universal optimal asymmetric cloners as defined in the previous sections.

A. Via local cloning

We again start with the general mixed state and apply local cloning(Eq.(5)) on each side. Tracing out appropriate qubits we obtain the local output states - $\tilde{\rho}_{13}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{24}$ and the nonlocal output states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$. We then calculate the geometric discord of both the local and nonlocal states. To achieve optimal broadcasting we require the nonlocal states to possess non-zero discord whereas the local pairs should possess zero discord i.e.

$$D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) > 0 \text{ and } D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0 \tag{24}$$

Theorem IV.1 *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^l), it is impossible to broadcast the QCsbE optimally within ρ_{12} into two lesser quantum correlated states: $\{\tilde{\rho}_{14}, \tilde{\rho}_{23}\}$.*

Proof: Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12}, when optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloner is applied locally at both ends to clone qubits '$1 \to 3$' and '$2 \to 4$', the local output states are obtained as in Eq. (11) and the nonlocal output states are obtained as in Eq. (13)

We calculate the discord for the local output states using Eq. (3) and the expressions are:

$$D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = \frac{(||\vec{x}||^2 + 4q^2)p^2}{2(1+qp)^2} \tag{25}$$

When we impose the condition for optimal broadcasting i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0$, we find that for this to happen either $p = 0$ or $||\vec{x}|| = q = 0$. In both these cases, $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{14})$ ceases to be positive. Hence, we arrive at the conclusion that given a two qubit mixed state, ρ_{12}, it is impossible to optimally broadcast QCsbE to obtain two lesser correlated states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ using universal optimal asymmetric local cloners.

B. Via nonlocal cloning

We again start with the general mixed state and apply cloning(Eq.(6)) nonlocally on both sides. Tracing out appropriate qubits we obtain the local output states - $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ and the nonlocal output states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$. We then calculate the geometric discord of both the local and nonlocal states. To achieve optimal broadcasting we require the nonlocal states to possess non-zero discord whereas the local pairs should possess zero discord i.e.

$$D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) > 0 \text{ and } D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0 \tag{26}$$

Theorem IV.2 *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^{nl}), it is impossible to broadcast the QCsbE optimally within ρ_{12} into two lesser quantum correlated states: $\{\tilde{\rho}_{12}, \tilde{\rho}_{34}\}$.*

Proof: Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12}, when optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloner is applied nonlocally at both ends, then the local output states are obtained as in Eq. (20) and the nonlocal output states are obtained as in Eq. (18)

We calculate the discord for the local output states using Eq. (3) and the expressions are:

$$D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = \frac{(||\vec{x}||^2(1+p)^2 + 2q^2)p^2}{2(2+3qp)^2} \tag{27}$$

When we impose the condition for optimal broadcasting i.e. $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13}) = 0$, we find that for this to happen either $p = 0$ or $||\vec{x}|| = q = 0$. In both these cases, $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{12})$ ceases to be positive. Hence, we arrive at the conclusion that given a two qubit mixed state, ρ_{12}, it is impossible to optimally broadcast QCsbE to obtain two lesser correlated states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ using universal optimal asymmetric nonlocal cloners.

V. NON-OPTIMAL BROADCASTING OF CORRELATIONS BEYOND ENTANGLEMENT USING ASYMMETRIC CLONER

In this section we investigate the non-optimal broadcasting of QCsbE under the unital channel (Λ_u) using universal optimal asymmetric cloners as defined in the previous sections.

A. Via local cloning

Claim : *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^l), it is always possible to broadcast the QCsbE non-optimally within ρ_{12} into two lesser quantum correlated states: $\{\tilde{\rho}_{14}, \tilde{\rho}_{23}\}$.*
In the previous section, we proved that $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13})$ is always positive. To support the claim, it is sufficient to show that $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{14}) > 0$. We calculate the discord for an exhaustive ensemble of states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and find that it is always positive for all values of asymmetric parameter except 0 i.e. $0 < p \leq 0.5$. Hence, we numerically conclude that it is always possible to broadcast QCsbE non-optimally. This is the direct opposite of the optimal case.

B. Via nonlocal cloning

Claim : *Given a two qubit general mixed state ρ_{12} and optimal universal asymmetric Pauli cloning transformation (U_a^{nl}), it is always possible to broadcast the QCsbE non-optimally within ρ_{12} into two lesser quantum correlated states: $\{\tilde{\rho}_{12}, \tilde{\rho}_{34}\}$.*
In the previous section, we proved that $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{13})$ is always positive. To support the claim, it is sufficient to show that $D_G(\tilde{\rho}_{12}) > 0$. We calculate the discord for an exhaustive ensemble of states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and find that it is always positive for all values of asymmetric parameter except 0 i.e. $0 < p \leq 0.5$. Hence, we numerically conclude that it is always possible to broadcast QCsbE non-optimally.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the existing literature we have come across many situations where mutual exclusivity is observed in context of various physical operations. In this work, while investigating the broadcasting of quantum entanglement and correlations going beyond entanglement with the help of asymmetric cloners, we observe that broadcasting makes a meaningful sense when we talk about optimal broadcasting in case of entanglement but such a phenomenon does not exist in case of correlations beyond entanglement. However, in non-optimal case, the situation is just reversed. Apart from this, we also demonstrate that the quality of broadcasting achieved is best when the cloner is perfectly symmetrical in nature in the most general situation. In short, we provide an extensive study of the different categories of broadcasting of all types of correlations with the most general form of cloners that exists in literature. Interestingly, we come up with intriguing features like mutual exclusivity and variations with asymmetricity of the cloning in the context of broadcasting.

Appendix-1: Inseparability range of nonlocal outputs obtained using local asymmetric cloners

In this section, we evaluate the determinants of W_2, W_3 and W_4 (as given in Eq. (2)) of the Peres-Horodecki criterion for the states $\tilde{\rho}_{14}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{23}$ given by Eq. (13). The expressions are as follows,

$$|W_2^l| = \frac{-1}{(2(q+p^2))^4}\Bigg[-1-p^8-2p^7(x_3-2)+\sum_{i=1}^{3}y_i^2+2p^5(8-6x_3+x_3^2-2\sum_{i=1}^{3}(-2y_i^2+t_{3i}y_i))+p^6(-10+6x_3-x_3^2$$
$$+\sum_{i=1}^{3}y_i^2)-2p^3(-8+6x_3-x_3^2+\sum_{i=1}^{3}(t_{3i}^2+5y_i^2-4t_{3i}y_i))+(p^4+p^2)(-19+14x_3-3x_3^2+\sum_{i=1}^{3}(t_{3i}^2+8y_i^2-6t_{3i}y_i))$$
$$+p^4(-9+8x_3-2x_3^2)\Bigg] \tag{28}$$

$$|W_3^l| = \frac{1}{(2(1+p^2+q^2))^6}\Bigg[-4f_4pq(-4(-A_-+B_-^x)(B_-^y-C_-)pq+4\delta_2f_2pq)+\delta(\delta_2\delta_3-4(B_-^y-C_-)(B_+^y-C_+)q^2)$$
$$+2(-A_++B_+^x)p(-2(-A_-+B_-^x)\delta_3p+8(B_+^y-C_+)f_2pq^2)\Bigg] \tag{29}$$

$$|W_4^l| = \frac{1}{(2(1+p^2+q^2))^8}\Big[\delta_4(-4f_4pq(-4(-A_- + B_-^x)(B_-^y - C_-)pq + 4\delta_2 f_2 pq) + \delta(\delta_2\delta_3 - 4(B_-^y - C_-)(B_+^y - C_+)q^2)$$
$$+ 2(-A_+ + B_+^x)p(-2(-A_- + B_-^x)\delta_3 p + 8(B_+^y - C_+)f_2 pq^2)) - 2(B_-^y + C_-)q(2(-A_+ + B_+^x)p(4(A_- + B_-^x)(B_+^y - C_+)pq$$
$$- 4\delta_3 p f_1 q) + 2(B_+^y + C_+)q(\delta_2\delta_3 - 4(B_-^y - C_-)(B_+^y - C_+)q^2) - 4f_4pq(2(A_- + B_-^x)\delta_2 p - 8(B_-^y - C_-)pf_1q^2))$$
$$+ 2(A_+ + B_+^x)p(2(B_+^y + C_+)q(-4(-A_- + B_-^x)(B_-^y - C_-)pq + 4\delta_2 f_2 pq) - \delta(2(A_- + B_-^x)\delta_2 p - 8(B_-^y - C_-)pf_1q^2)$$
$$+ 2(-A_+ + B_+^x)p(4(-A_- + B_-^x)(A_- + B_-^x)p^2 - 16f_2p^2f_1q^2)) - 4f_3pq(-\delta(4(A_- + B_-^x)(B_+^y - C_+)pq - 4\delta_3 pf_1q)$$
$$+ 2(B_+^y + C_+)q(-2(-A_- + B_-^x)\delta_3 p + 8(B_+^y - C_+)f_2pq^2) + 4f_4pq(4(-A_- + B_-^x)(A_- + B_-^x)p^2 - 16f_2p^2f_1q^2))\Big] \tag{30}$$

where $A_\pm = (-1+p^2-q^2)(it_{23} \pm t_{13})$, $\underset{k\in\{x,y\}}{B_\pm^k} = (1+p^2+q^2)(k_1 \pm ik_2)$,$C_\pm = (-1-p^2+q^2)(it_{31} \pm it_{32})$,
$X = (p^2+q^2+2)(p^2+q^2)+1$,$Y = -4pqt_{33}$,$\delta = X - 4(p^2+q)(px_3+qy_3) + Y$,$\delta_2 = X - 4(p^2+q)(-px_3+qy_3) - Y$,
$\delta_3 = X + 4(p^2+q)(px_3+qy_3) + Y$,$\delta_4 = X - 4(p^2+q)(px_3-qy_3) - Y$,$f_1 = t_{11} + it_{12} - it_{21} + t_{22}$,
$f_2 = t_{11} - it_{12} - it_{21} - t_{22}$,$f_3 = t_{11} - it_{12} + it_{21} + t_{22}$,$f_4 = t_{11} + it_{12} + it_{21} - t_{22}$

Appendix-2: Inseparability range of nonlocal outputs obtained using nonlocal cloners

In this section, we evaluate the determinants of W_2, W_3 and W_4 (as given in Eq. (2)) of the Peres-Horodecki criterion for the states $\tilde{\rho}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{34}$ given by Eq. (18). The expressions are as follows,

$$|W_2^{nl}| = \frac{-1}{16(1+3(p^2+q^2))^2}\Big[((t_{33}+y_3)^2 - (x_3+1)^2 + 8p^3((t_{31}+y_1)^2 + (t_{32}+y_2)^2) - 2q^2(4 + (t_{33}+y_3)^2 - (x_3-1)^2)$$
$$+ q^4((t_{33}+y_3)^2 - (x_3-3)^2) + p^4(9(t_{33}+y_3)^2 + 4(t_{32}+y_2)^2 + 4(t_{31}+y_1)^2 - 9(x_3+1)^2) - 2p^2(3(x_3+1)^2$$
$$- 2(y_1+t_{31})^2 - 2(y_2+t_{32})^2 - 3(y_3+t_{33})^2 + 3q^2(4 - (x_3-1)^2 + (t_{33}+y_3)^2)))\Big] \tag{31}$$

$$|W_3^{nl}| = \frac{1}{(4\alpha_1)^3}\Big[-2f_4p(1+p)(-4g_1h_1p^2(1+p)^2 + 2f_2p(1+p)(-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) + 2g_3p(1+p)(4h_2f_2p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$- 2g_1p(1+p)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) + (-4h_1h_2p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$+ (-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1))(\lambda_1-\lambda_3+\alpha_1-x_3\alpha_2)\Big] \tag{32}$$

$$|W_4^{nl}| = \frac{1}{(4\alpha_1)^4}\Big[-2h_4p(1+p)(-2f_4p(1+p)(-4h_1p^2(1+p)^2f_1 + 2g_2p(1+p)(-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1))$$
$$+ 2g_3p(1+p)(4g_2h_2p^2(1+p)^2 - 2p(1+p)f_1(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) + 2h_3p(1+p)(-4h_1h_2p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$+ (-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1))) + 2g_4p(1+p)(2g_3p(1+p)(4g_1g_2p^2(1+p)^2 - 4f_2p^2(1+p)^2f_1)$$
$$+ 2h_3p(1+p)(-4g_1h_1p^2(1+p)^2 + 2f_2p(1+p)(-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) - (-4h_1p^2(1+p)^2f_1$$
$$+ 2g_2p(1+p)(-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1))(\lambda_1-\lambda_3+\alpha_1-x_3\alpha_2)) - 2f_3p(1+p)(2f_4p(1+p)(4g_1g_2p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$- 4f_2p^2(1+p)^2f_1) + 2h_3p(1+p)(4h_2f_2p^2(1+p)^2 - 2g_1p(1+p)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) - (4g_2h_2p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$- 2p(1+p)f_1(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1))(\lambda_1-\lambda_3+\alpha_1-x_3\alpha_2)) + (-\lambda_1+\alpha_1-x_3\alpha_2-y3\alpha_2)(-2f_4p(1+p)(-4g_1h_1p^2(1+p)^2$$
$$+ 2f_2p(1+p)(-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)) + 2g_3p(1+p)(4h_2f_2p^2(1+p)^2 - 2g_1p(1+p)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1))$$
$$+ (-4h_1h_2p^2(1+p)^2 + (-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3+\alpha_1)(\lambda_1-\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\alpha_1))(\lambda_1-\lambda_3+\alpha_1-x_3\alpha_2))\Big] \tag{33}$$

where $g_1 = t_{13} - it_{23} + x_1 - ix_2$,$g_2 = -t_{13} + it_{23} + x_1 - ix_2$,$g_3 = t_{13} + it_{23} + x_1 + ix_2$,$g_4 = -t_{13} - it_{23} + x_1 + ix_2$,
$h_1 = t_{31} - it_{32} + y_1 - iy_2$,$h_2 = t_{31} + it_{32} + y_1 + iy_2$,$h_3 = -t_{31} - it_{32} + y_1 + iy_2$,$h_4 = -t_{31} + it_{32} + y_1 - iy_2$,
$\alpha_1 = 2(2 - 3pq)$,$\alpha_2 = 1 + 3p^2 - q^2$,$\lambda_1 = -\alpha_2 t_{33}$,$\lambda_2 = -\alpha_2 x_3$,$\lambda_3 = -\alpha_2 y_3$

[1] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802 (1982).
[2] H. Barnum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2818 (1996).
[3] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).
[4] H. Barnum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 240501 (2007).
[5] S. Luo, Lett. Math. Phys. **92**, 143 (2010).
[6] S. Luo, N. Li and X. Cao, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 054305 (2009).
[7] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2818 (1996).
[8] Sourav Chatterjee, Sk Sazim, and Indranil Chakrabarty Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042309 (2016).
[9] P. Shor,Algorithms for Quantum Computation: Discrete Logarithms andFactoring, Proc. 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of ComputerScience. IEEE Press, pp 124-134, Nov. 1994
[10] Indranil Chakrabarty, Udit Kamal Sharma, Manish Kumar Shukla arXiv:1605.02458
[11] Manish Kumar Shukla, Indranil Chakrabarty, Sourav Chatterjee arXiv:1511.05796
[12] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1844 (1996).
[13] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4999 (1998); L. Hardy and D. D. Song, Phys. Lett. A **259**, 331 (1999).
[14] D. Bruss and C. Macchiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 127901 (2002).
[15] N. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 127902 (2002).
[16] A. Ferenczi and N. Luetkenhaus, Phys. Rev. A 85, 052310 (2012).
[17] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993); R. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **222**, 21 (1996).
[18] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Weisner, Phys.Rev.Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992); R. Nepal *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032336 (2013).
[19] M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Berthiaume, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1829 (1999); Sk Sazim *et al.*, Quantum. Inf. Process. **14**, 4651 (2015); S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty and P. Agrawal, Quant. Inf. Comp. **12**, 0253 (2012); M. Ray, S. Chatterjee, and I. Chakrabarty, Eur. Phys. J. D 70, 114 (2016).
[20] A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[21] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, System and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, pp.175-179 (1984); P. W. Shor and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 441 (2000).
[22] S. Adhikari, I. Chakrabarty, and B. S. Choudhary, J. Phys. A **39**, 8439 (2006).
[23] V. Buzek *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 3327 (1997).
[24] S. Bandyopadhyay and G. Kar, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3296 (1999).
[25] I. Ghiu, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012323 (2003).
[26] I. Chakrabarty, Int. J. Quant. Inf, **7** (02), 559-565.
[27] Lov K. Grover STOC '96 Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing
[28] Murao, M., M. B. Plenio, and V. Vedral, 2000, Phys. Rev. A61, 032311.
[29] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett.77, 1413 (1996); M. Horodecki,P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A223, 1(1996)
[30] G. Vidal, R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002)
[31] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998); A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008); S.L. Braunstein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999); D. A. Meyer, ibid. **85**, 2014 (2000); S. L. Braunstein and A. K. Pati, Quant. Inf. Comp. **2**, 399 (2002); A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **72** 042316 (2005); A. Datta and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 042310 (2007); B. P. Lanyon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008); M. Piani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 220403 (2011); A. R. Usha Devi and A. K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 140502 (2008); M. Dugić, M. Arsenijević and J. Jeknić-Dugić, Science China Physics, Mechanics and Astronomy **56**, 732 (2013).
[32] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001); L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001); S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008); K. Modi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010); J.-S. Xu *et al.*, Nature Commun. **4**, 2851 (2013); B. Bellomo *et al.*, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **9**, 1665 (2011); R. Lo Franco *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345053 (2013); R. Lo Franco *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032318 (2012).
[33] K. Modi *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
[34] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, and A. K. Pati, Eur. Phys. J D **65**, 605 (2011); I. Chakrabarty, S. Banerjee, and N. Siddharth, Quant. Inf. Comp. **11**, 0541 (2011).
[35] I. Chakrabarty, B. S. Choudhury , Elec. J. Theor. Phys, 6, 119 (2009).
[36] N. Gisin and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2153 (1997).
[37] Satyabrata Adhikari, B S Choudhury and Indranil Chakrabarty, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General, Volume 39, Number 26 (2006).
[38] Marius Lemm, Mark M. Wilde, arXiv:1608.07569